



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,649	12/29/2000	Ashok Singhal	M-8495 US	9244

32566 7590 09/12/2005

PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
2635 NORTH FIRST STREET
SUITE 223
SAN JOSE, CA 95134

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, STEVE N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/751,649	SINGHAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steve Nguyen	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3 and 10-13 are pending. Non-elected claims 7-9 in the prior Office Action are cancelled. Claims 10-13 are newly submitted.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-3 and 10-12, drawn to a communication link protocol for communicating between nodes of an interconnect system via a communication link with built in self testing, classified in class 714, subclass 733.
- II. Claims 4-6, drawn to a communication link protocol for communicating between nodes of an interconnect system via a communication link with a link watchdog communication and transmitting control information in command packets and acknowledgement packets, classified in class 714, subclass 712.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention Group I has separate utility such as a communication link protocol with a BIST command for

testing the functionality of the communication link. In the instant case, invention Group II has separate utility such as a communication link protocol comprising a link watchdog communication receiving piggybacked acknowledgement packets in response to a network test. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with David C. Hsia on 9/1/2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-3 and 10-12. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 4-6 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that "the lines cited against (1) the DMA write command and (2) the memory copy write command all describe the operation of a reflected write. The reflected write of Steely, Jr. et al. cannot be both (1) the DMA write command and (2) the memory copy write command recited in claim 1."

The Examiner asserts that Steely teaches the above limitations as originally cited. In the description of col. 7, lines 13-32, Steely discloses an example of a write

Art Unit: 2133

operation from a local node to a remote node (see col. 6, lines 47-50). Steely further teaches a direct memory access (DMA) command (col. 7, lines 29-30) for writing a block of data from a local node to a remote node (col. 7, lines 15-16) via the communication link (col. 9, lines 8-9).

The system of Steely is directed to a reflective memory parallel computing system, disclosed in col. 1, lines 52-67. A significant feature of a reflective memory system is the ability to "reflect" data written into a specific portion of memory to other nodes of the network (col. 1, lines 65-67). Thus, the generic description of the data write process by Steely in col. 7, lines 13-32 also applies for a reflective memory write process. In particular, Steely teaches the memory copy write command in col. 8, lines 41-43.

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant and maintains all rejections of claims 1-3. All amendments and arguments by the Applicant have been considered. It is the Examiner's conclusion that claims 1-6 and 10-13 are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art of record. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 13 is objected to for reciting a negative limitation defining what the invention is not, rather than pointing out the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 13 recites the limitation, "wherein said writing a line of memory from a local node to a remote node is devoid of any address mapping." However, this limitation is not supported by the original specification. The Applicant contends that new claim 13 is supported by page 28, line 4 to page 29, line 22. However, the lines recited above only disclose a method for communicating data from a local node to a remote node via a communication link using a link protocol. Merged data from a local node is written into the cluster memory at the remote node (see page 29, lines 11-22). Nowhere does the Applicant disclose that the link protocol operates without the use of address mapping.

5. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 13 recites the limitation, "wherein said writing a line of memory from a local node to a remote node is devoid of any address mapping." However, the specification merely teaches a method for communicating data from a local node to a remote node via a communication link using a link protocol, wherein merged data from a local node is written into the cluster memory at the remote node (see page 29, lines 11-22). The specification does not disclose doing so without the use of address mapping. It is unclear how data can be communicated in the system without mapping to the destination address of the remote memory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-3, 10, and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steely, Jr. et al (US Pat. 6,049,889; hereafter referred to as Steely) in view of Grivna (US Pat. 5,850,556).

As per claim 1:

Steely teaches a communication link protocol for communicating between nodes of an interconnect system via a communication link, the communication link protocol comprising:

- a direct memory access (DMA) command for writing a block of data from a local node to a remote node via the communication link (col. 7, lines 26-32);
- an administrative write command for writing data from a local node to registers in a remote node via the communication link for administrative purposes (col. 5, lines 36-45);
- a memory copy write command for writing a line of memory from a local node to a remote node via the communication link when any data is written into that line of memory (col. 6, lines 46-47; col. 7, lines 13-15).

Not explicitly disclosed by Steely is a built in self test (BIST) command for testing the functionality of the communication link. However, Grivna teaches a communication system which uses a BIST testing logic for testing the functionality of the communication link (col. 6, lines 52-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a BIST testing architecture as described by Grivna with the system of Steely to issue a BIST command for testing the functionality of the communication link. This modification would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2133

to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that BIST would have provided the advantage of allowing diagnostics of the communication link, as described by Grivna in column 6, lines 52-56.

As per claim 2:

Steely and Grivna teach the communication link protocol of Claim 1 wherein each command is conveyed between a local node and a remote node in the form of a respective command packet (col. 9, lines 8-9).

As per claim 3:

Steely and Grivna teach the communication link protocol of Claim 2 wherein each respective command packet carries information for at least one command flag (col. 9, lines 18-23; the DV bits are a command flag that dictate the occurrence of an idle cycle).

As per claim 10:

Steely further teaches the communication link protocol of Claim 1, wherein said writing a block of data from a local node to a remote node comprises copying the block of data from a local memory of the local node to a remote memory of the remote node (col. 8, lines 41-43).

As per claim 12:

Steely further teaches the communication link protocol of Claim 1, wherein said writing a line of memory from a local node to a remote node comprises reading existing data from the line of memory in a local memory of the local node, merging new data

Art Unit: 2133

with the existing data, and writing merged data to a corresponding line of memory in a remote memory of the remote node (col. 6, lines 36-42; Steely discloses parity computation and checking at the nodes. Parity is computed at the transmitting node by reading existing data and merging newly computed parity data with the existing data. The merged data comprising the data with its parity bits are then transmitted to the receiver).

7. Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steely in view of Grivna as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gunsaulus et al (US Pat. 5,914,970; hereinafter referred to as Gunsualus).

As per claim 11:

Steely and Grivna teach the communication link protocol of claim 1 above. Not explicitly disclosed is said writing a block of data from a local node to a remote node comprises computing parity over multiple blocks of data from a local memory of the local node and writing the parity to a remote memory of the remote node. However, Gunsaulus in an analogous art teaches computing parity for a number of memory devices and writing the parity in one dedicated memory device (col. 1, lines 46-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compute parity over multiple blocks of data and write the parity to a remote memory of the remote node. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using one memory

Art Unit: 2133

device for parity storage reduces the number of memory devices needed for storing parity, as disclosed by Gunsaulus in col. 1, lines 52-55.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7214. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steve Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2133



ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100